UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/576,545	07/05/2006	Stephane Tuffin	127745	3849	
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 07/30/201 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 3208	350	CHAO, MICHAEL W			
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2442		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/30/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
TUFFIN ET AL.	
Art Unit	
2442	
	TUFFIN ET AL.  Art Unit

	Wilchael Chao	2442	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a)⊠ They raise new issues that would require further co	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ottod olamno.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOI -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphane, anonamone (	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).		ory mod amoriamo.	it carrooming the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-77.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	4 da NOT ala 4b ali - 4i i a		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		i condition for allowan	ce pecause:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	P10/58/08) Paper No(s)		
/Asad M Nawaz/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Amendment After Final changes the scope of the claims, requiring further search and consideration; specifically the argued 'router'.

Continuation of 11. Does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments largely recite previously addressed arguments and the After Final Amendment's 'router' and need not be addressed. Regarding Applicant's bulleted arguments on page 7:

That the combination of Richmond in view of Ghys would cause all excess packets to be dropped is not persuasive. Either because no packets other than initialization packets are actually required by claim 1 or because dropping packets is required by the claim, the argument is not persuasive. Note also that the packet rules can be specific to initialization messages, and there can be multiple rules (See Richmond as cited and Abstract).

That the combination of richmond in view of Ghys would achieve a second system implemented to estimate a bill (Ghys) is not persuasive. As discussed on pages 6 and 7 of Final Rejection dated 5/25/2010, Richmond discloses all the filtering required in claim 1, and lacks only in the specific motivation to filter initialization messages, though fully capable of doing so. Ghys was added to teach that initialization messages were a particular threat to operators that was known at the time of invention. Such a teaching need not be accompanied by the billing of Ghys.